

**Remarks**

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in view of the above amendments and in light of the following remarks and discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 are currently pending in the application; Claims 1-6 having been amended in a non-narrowing manner to remedy potential informalities and to place the claims in better conformity with standard U.S. practice. Applicants respectfully assert that support for the changes to the claims is self-evident from the originally filed disclosure, including the original claims, and that therefore no new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 3, 5, and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,252,269 to Hara et al. (Hara).

Initially, Applicants express thanks for the Examiner's indication that dependent Claims 2 and 4 recite allowable subject matter, such that the dependent claims, although currently objected to, would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

As stated above in the Office Action Claims 1, 3, 5, and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hara. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn for the following reasons.

The current invention is directed to methods of manufacturing a product. Independent Claim 1 recites, among other features, filling a resin containing a foaming agent into a mold cavity by injection within a time period from a time point just before completion of mold clamping to a time point after the completion of mold clamping.

Hara is directed to a method for molding polypropylene resin. As shown in Figure 1, for example, of Hara, after a resin supply is started, a female mold is lifted up to increase a cavity clearance (t) so that a pressure on a resin melt is maintained in a range between 5 to

Application No. 10/087,828  
Reply to Office Action of October 23, 2003

100 kg/cm<sup>2</sup> during the supply of the resin melt, whereby the resin melt is supplied all over the cavity surface (second step, between points C and D in FIG. 1).<sup>1</sup>

Thus, contrary to the Office Action's assertions, Applicants respectfully assert that Hara does not teach or suggest the claimed features of filling a resin containing a foaming agent into a mold cavity by injection within a time period from a time point just before completion of mold clamping to a time point after the completion of mold clamping, as recited in independent Claim 1. Rather, as stated above, because Hara shows and states that the cavity clearance increases as the resin melt is supplied, Applicants respectfully assert that Hara does not show or state filling a resin into a mold from a time point just before completion of mold clamping to a time point after the completion of mold clamping. Restated, because Hara shows and states that the cavity clearance is increasing, Hara does not show or state mold clamping.

Independent Claim 1 recites "filling a resin containing a foaming agent into a mold cavity by injection within a time period from a time point just before completion of mold clamping to a time point after the completion of mold clamping."

Applicants respectfully assert that the claimed method of manufacturing recited in independent Claim 1 provides advantages over Hara. By way of specific non-limiting example, Applicants respectfully assert that the claimed method can provide a resin filled in a mold cavity constantly applied with a clamping pressure, such that the resin can be restrained from being foamed by the foaming agent, and therefore formation of a flash mark or silver mark does not occur.<sup>2</sup>

Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn and the independent claim allowed.

---

<sup>1</sup> Column 2, lines 41-47.

<sup>2</sup> Please see, for example, from page 4, line 15 to page 5, line 15; and from page 12, line 23 to page 13, line 10, of Applicant's originally filed disclosure.

Application No. 10/087,828  
Reply to Office Action of October 23, 2003

Dependent Claims 2-6 are allowable for the same reasons as the independent claim from which they depend, as well as for their own features. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to and rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of the dependent claims be withdrawn, and the allowance of dependent Claims 2-6.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-6 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/03)

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gregory J. Maier  
Registration No. 25,599  
Attorney of Record

Philip J. Hoffmann  
Registration No. 46,340

GJM/PH/me  
I:\ATTY\PH\22s\220173\PRP AM 030904.DOC